Meeting Date and Time: Tuesday, October 4, 2022 12:30PM - 1:30PM

Meeting Location: This meeting was via Microsoft Teams

Members Present: Jon Murad, Wilda White, Roger Marcoux, Steve Coote

Members Absent: Justin Stedman, Tom Mozzer Others in Attendance: Lindsay Thivierge, Chris Brickell,

Evan Meenan

Call to Order 12:35 PM

No Additions or deletion to the agenda

Discussion around Proposed Rule Changes

- Evan Meenan gave a presentation as to the current status of Rules and where the Entrance Test Working Group fits into the discussion.
- The Council can move forward with proposed changes and leave entry requirements and curriculum changes off of this round of Rule changes to be discussed further and proposed at a later date. Or the Council can wait for all discussions to take place before proposing a rule change.
- Proposed appropriation from the legislature to hire a consultant to complete a needs assessment could potentially include a curriculum and entry requirements assessment.

Discussion ensued around current state of Rules:

- Current Rule states that PT requirement is for all three levels of certification but only the Level III complete a PT test, should this be changed?
- Possibilities for Rule change include changes to make language more inclusive or more exclusive. The Council
 could make Rules vague and then create procedures and policies that are specific to remove some of the
 boundaries that exist and make them more flexible.
- The Entrance Test working group discussed whether a presentation should be prepared for the Council that
 explains what currently is in place in practice at the academy and what the entrance test working group would
 like to have happen. This would allow the Council to have a full understanding of each of the requirements and
 how curriculum is impacted.
- ETWG and Rules committees could meet and discuss rule changes if they were substantive. If they are minor
 word changes they could be presented as part of proposed changes to the TAC and/or the Council.
- The Council should weigh in how they would like these standards and definitions memorialized in Rule, there
 are some areas in Rule where there is confusion.

Discussion ensued around polygraph

- There is no definition for what Candidate means.
- Polygraph and Background should be separate
- The Council needs to define the requirements for law enforcement officers and the parameters for those requirements.



- Chief Murad will send small line item changes to Evan for clarity in language.
- Next agenda includes discussion of what the next steps are for the presentation and have thoughts around what to bring forward to the TAC/Council as far as recommended changes.

Motion to adjourn Roger Marcoux, second Steve Coote, all in favor. Meeting adjourned 13:32